

QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)

PROGRAM MANAGER, WARFARE (PMW) FOR UNDERSEA INTEGRATION (770) ACQUISITION PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SUPPORT SERVICES



Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose.....	1
1.2 Performance Management Approach	1
1.3 Performance Management Strategy	2
2 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	2
2.1 The Primary Contracting Officer (PCO).....	2
2.2 The Contracting Officer's Representative (COR)	2
3 IDENTIFICATION OF REQUIRED PERFORMANCE STANDARDS/QUALITY LEVELS...	3
4 METHODOLOGIES TO MONITOR PERFORMANCE.....	3
4.1 Surveillance Techniques	3
4.2 Customer Feedback.....	3
4.3 Acceptable Quality Levels (AQLs)	3
5 QUALITY ASSURANCE DOCUMENTATION.....	4
5.1 The Performance Management Feedback Loop	4
5.2 Monitoring Forms	4
6 ANALYSIS OF QUALITY ASSURANCE ASSESSMENT.....	4
6.1 Determining Performance.....	4
6.2 Reporting.....	4
6.3 Reviews and Resolution.....	4
ATTACHMENT 1 - PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY	6
ATTACHMENT 2 - QUALITY ASSURANCE MONITORING FORM.....	7
ATTACHMENT 3 - CUSTOMER SURVEY FORM	8

QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)

1 INTRODUCTION

This Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) is pursuant to the requirements listed in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) entitled Program Manager, Warfare (PMW) for Undersea Integration (770) Acquisition Program Management Support Services. This plan sets forth the procedures and guidelines PMW 770 will use to ensure the required performance standards or services levels are maintained by the Contractor.

1.1 Purpose

1.1.1 The purpose of the QASP is to describe the systematic methods used to monitor performance and to identify the required documentation and resources to be employed. The QASP provides a means of evaluating whether the Contractor is meeting the performance standards and quality levels identified in the PWS and the Contractor's Quality Control Plan (QCP); and to ensure that the Government pays only for the level of services received.

1.1.2 This QASP defines the roles and responsibilities of all Integrated Project Team (IPT) members, identifies the performance objectives, defines the methodologies used to monitor and evaluate the Contractor's performance, describes Quality Assurance (QA) documentation requirements, and describes the analysis of QA monitoring results.

1.2 Performance Management Approach

1.2.1 The PWS structures the acquisition around "what" service or quality level is required, as opposed to "how" the contractor should perform the work (i.e., results, not process). This QASP will define the Performance Management approach taken by PMW 770 to monitor and manage the Contractor's performance; to ensure the expected outcomes or objectives communicated in the PWS are achieved. Performance Management rests on developing a capability to review and analyze information generated through performance assessment. This analysis yields information that indicates whether expected outcomes are being achieved by the Contractor. The ability to make decisions based on performance assessment data is the cornerstone of Performance Management.

1.2.2 Performance Management focuses on assessing whether, and to what extent outcomes are being achieved. A performance-based approach enables the Contractor to play a large role in how the work is performed; as long as the proposed processes are within stated constraints. The only exceptions to process reviews are those required by law (federal, state, and local) and compelling business situations, such as safety and health. A "results" focus provides the Contractor flexibility to continuously improve and innovate over the Period of Performance (PoP); as long as the critical outcomes expected are being achieved and the desired performance levels are being met.

1.3 Performance Management Strategy

1.3.1 The Contractor is responsible for the quality of all work performed; measuring that quality through the Contractor's own Quality Control (QC) Program (QCP). QC is work output, not workers; and therefore includes all work performed under this contract, regardless of whether the work is performed by Contractor employees or by Sub-Contractors. The Contractor's QCP will set forth the staffing and procedures for self-inspecting the quality, timeliness, responsiveness, customer satisfaction, and other performance requirements in the PWS. The Contractor will develop and implement a Performance Management system, with processes to assess and report performance to the designated government representative. This QASP enables the government to take advantage of the Contractor's QCP.

1.3.2 The Government representative(s) will monitor performance; reviewing Contractor-furnished performance reports to determine how the Contractor is performing against communicated performance objectives. The Contractor will be responsible for making required changes in processes and practices to ensure performance is managed effectively.

2 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1 The Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO)

The Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) is responsible for monitoring contract compliance, contract administration, and cost control; and for resolving any differences between the observations documented by the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) and the Contractor. The PCO will designate, in writing, one full-time COR as the government authority for performance management. The number of additional representatives serving as Technical Inspectors depends on the complexity of the services measured, as well as the Contractor's performance, and must be identified and designated, in writing, by the PCO.

2.2 The Contracting Officer's Representative (COR)

The Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) is designated by the PCO to act as his authorized representative to assist in administering a contract. COR limitations are contained in the written appointment letter. The COR is responsible for the technical administration of the project and ensures proper government surveillance of Contractor performance. The COR is not empowered to make any contractual commitments, or to authorize any contractual changes on the Government's behalf. Any changes the Contractor deems may affect contract price, terms, or conditions shall be referred to the PCO, for action. The COR will have the responsibility of completing QA Monitoring Forms (Attachment 2); used to document the inspection and evaluation of Contractor performance. Government surveillance may occur under the inspection of services clause for any service relating to the contract.

3 IDENTIFICATION OF REQUIRED PERFORMANCE STANDARDS/QUALITY LEVELS

The required performance standards and/or quality levels are included in the PWS, and in Attachment 1 to this QASP, Performance Requirements Summary.

4 METHODOLOGIES TO MONITOR PERFORMANCE

4.1 Surveillance Techniques

In an effort to minimize the Performance Management burden, simplified surveillance methods shall be used by the Government to evaluate Contractor performance when appropriate. The primary methods of surveillance are:

- 100% Inspection – Appropriate Government customers shall review the generated documentation and report the results, as described in paragraph 4.2 below.
- Periodic Inspection – The COR typically performs the periodic inspection on a monthly basis.
- Customer observations – Government customers may provide feedback and observations any time during the performance of the task.

4.2 Customer Feedback

The Contractor is expected to establish and maintain professional communication between its employees and customers. The primary objective of this communication is customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction is the most significant external indicator of the success and effectiveness of all services provided, and can be measured through positive, negative and neutral customer feedback.

Performance Management drives the Contractor to be customer-focused, through first internally addressing and investigating customer concerns. However, the customer always has the option to communicate concerns to the Contractor via the COR.

To be considered valid, customer complaints must detail the nature of the complaint clearly and in writing; and be sent to the COR. The COR will investigate customer complaints, involving the PCO when appropriate.

Customer feedback may also be obtained from formal customer satisfaction surveys or random customer complaints.

4.3 Acceptable Quality Levels (AQLs)

The Acceptable Quality Levels (AQLs) included in Attachment 1 to this QASP, Performance Requirements Summary Table, define acceptable quality levels. Levels of performance are keyed to the relative importance of the task to the overall mission performance at PMW 770.

N00024-16-R-3048

5 QUALITY ASSURANCE DOCUMENTATION

5.1 The Performance Management Feedback Loop

The Performance Management feedback loop begins with the communication of expected outcomes. Performance standards are expressed in the PWS; and are assessed using the performance monitoring techniques shown in Attachment 1.

5.2 Monitoring Forms

The Government's QA surveillance, accomplished by the COR and Government customers, will be reported using the Monitoring Forms (Attachment 2) and Customer Survey Form (Attachment 3). These forms, along with customer comments received by other means (e.g., informal e-mails) will document the Government's assessment of the Contractor's performance under the contract to ensure that the required results and quality are being achieved.

5.2.1 The COR will retain a copy of all completed QA surveillance forms.

6 ANALYSIS OF QUALITY ASSURANCE ASSESSMENT

6.1 Determining Performance

6.1.1 Government shall use the cited monitoring methods to determine whether the performance standards/service levels/AQLs have been met. If the Contractor has not met or is not maintaining the minimum requirements, it may be asked to develop a Performance Improvement Plan in order to show how and by what date it intends to bring performance up to the required levels.

6.2 Reporting

6.2.1 If the government determines via methods cited that the contractor has not met the minimum requirements, the COR will meet with the contractor at the end of each month and summarize the overall results of the contractor's performance. On a quarterly basis, the Government will provide a written report to the contractor, summarizing the overall results of the QA surveillance of the Contractor's performance. This written report, which includes the Contractor's submitted monthly report and the completed Quality Assurance Monitoring Form (Attachment 2), will become part of the QA documentation. It will enable the Government to demonstrate whether the Contractor is meeting the stated objectives and performance standards, including cost/technical/scheduling objectives.

6.3 Reviews and Resolution

6.3.1 The COR may require the Contractor's Project Manager, or a designated alternate, to meet with the PCO, Assistant Contracting Officer (ACO), Program Manager (PM) and/or other Government personnel, as deemed necessary to discuss performance evaluation. The COR will define a frequency of in-depth reviews with the Contractor, including appropriate self-assessments by the Contractor. However, if the need arises, the Contractor will meet with designated

N00024-16-R-3048

Government personnel as often as required, or per the Contractor's request. The agenda of the reviews may include:

- Monthly performance assessment data and trend analysis
- Issues and concerns of both parties
- Projected outlook for upcoming months and progress against expected trends, including a corrective action plan analysis
- Recommendations for improved efficiency and/or effectiveness
- Issues arising from the performance monitoring processes

6.3.2 The COR must communicate and coordinate with the Contractor to resolve issues and concerns regarding marginal or unacceptable performance.

6.3.3 The COR and Contractor should jointly formulate tactical and long-term courses of action. Decisions regarding changes to metrics, thresholds, or service levels should be clearly documented. Changes to service levels, procedures, and metrics will be incorporated as a contract modification at the convenience of the PCO/ACO.

ATTACHMENT 1 - PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY

Required Services (Tasks)	Performance Standards	Acceptable Quality Levels	Methods of Surveillance
Officially routed documents (e.g., CDRLS A001, A002)	As defined in the PWS	As defined in the PWS	Inspection
Program and Functional lead products and services	CPARs Categories	Satisfactory or above as defined in CPARs ratings	Periodic inspections, customer observations

N00024-16-R-3048

ATTACHMENT 2 - QUALITY ASSURANCE MONITORING FORM

CONTRACT #: N00024-16-R-3048

PERIOD: _____ to _____
DD MMM YY DD MMM YYYY

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

RESPONSES:

REQUIRED SERVICES	PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AREA OF ASSESSMENT	RATING
CDRLs: A001 (MSR) A002 (Trip Report)	QUALITY AND TIMELINESS	
PROGRAM AND FUNCTIONAL LEAD PRODUCTS AND SERVICES	PERFORMANCE	
	QUALITY OF PRODUCT AND SERVICE	
	SCHEDULE	
	COST CONTROL	
	MANAGEMENT	

OVERALL RATING	Contract Requirements	Problems	Corrective Actions

N00024-16-R-3048

ATTACHMENT 3 - CUSTOMER SURVEY FORM

CONTRACT #: N00024-16-R-3048

PERIOD: _____ to _____
DD MMM YY DD MMM YYYY

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE: _____

PROGRAM OR FUNCTIONAL AREA: _____

PART I: DOCUMENTS FOR OFFICIAL ROUTING (CDRLS A001 and A002)

Risk Level	Count of Documents	Brief Explanation (Yellow and Red only)
Red		
Yellow		
Green		n/a
TOTAL		n/a

PART II: ASSESSMENT OF CONTRACTOR PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

- a. Give a performance rating for each of the following assessment areas. Rating definitions are below.

Assessment Area	Quality	Schedule	Cost Control	Management
Performance Rating				

- b. Provide a brief description of any ratings below Satisfactory:

RATING DEFINITIONS

RATING	REQUIREMENTS	PROBLEMS	RISK LEVEL	CORRECTIVE ACTIONS
Exceptional	Exceeds; many Government benefits	Few Minor	Green	Highly effective
Very Good	Exceeds; some Government benefits	Some Minor	Green	Effective
Satisfactory	Meets all	Some Minor	Green	Satisfactory
Marginal	Does not meet some	Serious: recovery still possible	Yellow	Marginally effective; not fully implemented
Unsatisfactory	Does not meet most	Serious: recovery not likely	Red	Ineffective

N00024-16-R-3048
18 February 2016